

**Joint District Materials, Research Engineers', and District
Construction Engineers' Meeting
February 10, 2016
Agenda**

New/Recurring Business:

1) Introductions, Opening Remarks, and Agenda Overview (Tim Ruelke and David Sadler)

Roll call acknowledging those in attendance. An overview of the meeting agenda will be provided.

Summary Notes: Attendees present were:

D1 – Jon Sands, Brian Penny, Brian Blair, Blake Stallworth, Sam Joseph

D2 – Carrie Stanbridge, Travis Humphries, Stephen Sedwick

D3 – Ed Hudec, Ranae Sanders, Blair Martin

D4 – Carolyn Gish, Deb Ihsan, Benjamin Burton

D5 – Amy Scales, Jennifer Smith, John Hatfield

D6 – Mario Cabrera, Heidi Solaun-Dominguez, Deborah Rivera

D7 – Bill Jones, Megan Arasteh

TP – Pete Nissen, Bill Sears, Ken Morgan

CO – Tom Byron, David Sadler, Amy Tootle, Jason Watts, Denise Johnson, Calvin Johnson, Tim Ruelke, Alicia Andress, Larry Ritchie

FHWA – Rafiq Darji, Chad Thompson

2) CTQM Updates (Reference Documents Attached) (Larry Ritchie)

This is a continuation from the October meeting. The group to discuss CTQM Chapter 4 updates. Chapter 1 update due to construction bulletin 03-15.

For Chapter 1 Review:

Ch 1_2-10-16 updates (track changes PDF of chapter)

Chapter 1 update notes (brief description of why & what for the update)

CBull03-15 (Construction Bulletin 03-15 on CTQP exam policies)

For chapter 4 Review:

CTQM CH 4 FINAL (chapter after changes)

CTQM Ch 4 revised 3-22-11 (chapter prior to changes)

CTQM Chapter 4 update notes (list of what the updates are in chapter 4)

Summary Notes: The DCE's and DMRE's voted on chapter updates with the majority voting in favor of the changes on both chapters.

D1 – DCE – Yes DMRE – Abstain
D2 – DCE – Yes DMRE Yes
D3 – DCE/DMRE - Yes
D4 – DCE/DMRE - Yes
D5 – DCE/DMRE - Yes
D6 – DCE/DMRE - Yes
D7 – DCE/DMRE - Yes
TP – DCE/DMRE - Yes

3) Job Guide Schedule for Design-Build and Lump Sum projects (Reference Documents Attached) (Tim Ruelke)

Discuss the enforcement of the Job Guide Schedule for Design-Build and Lump Sum projects.

105-2 Additional Requirements for Lump Sum Projects.

Prepare and submit to the Engineer a project-specific list of material items and quantities to be used on the project as a Job Guide Schedule in the same format as the current rSampling, Testing, and Reporting Guide 21 calendar days prior to commencement of construction. Provide up-to-date quantities for the items on the Job Guide Schedule to the Engineer with each monthly progress estimate. The Department may not authorize payment of any progress estimate not accompanied by updated Job Guide Schedule quantities. Maintain the Job Guide Schedule throughout the project including the quantity placed since the previous submittal, and total to date quantity and any additional materials placed. Do not commence work activities that require testing until the Job Guide Schedule has been reviewed and accepted by the Engineer. At final acceptance, submit a final Job Guide Schedule that includes all materials used on the project in the same format as the monthly reports.

Summary Notes: Tim discussed the findings of the Auditor General with the group. The audit found that several projects did not have a job guide schedule. This must be provided 21 calendar days before construction. Folks need to ensure we're meeting the required testing frequency. The Auditor General has been informed that all projects will be up to speed with job guide schedules by July. Job guide schedules can be submitted in pieces and the testing can be completed for each piece on projects that are lump sum with a MAC specification.

4) Warranty Defects – Section 388 (Jim Musselman)

The group to discuss how involved Districts should be in determining the cause of warranty defects as defined in Section 338.

Summary Notes: The group discussed where the District Warranty coordinators are currently housed and it seems to be split on either Construction or Maintenance. Tim Ruelke will send a request for the amount of warranty events occurring in the Districts to get an updated count for 2015. Some of the Districts would like District Material personnel to conduct a forensic investigation into warranty items before they pursue resolution. Guidance may need to be issued on when to get District Materials involved with warranty issues. District personnel should engage the contractor with warranty issues but be prepared before we approach. District 6 is experiencing a lot of warranty challenges for asphalt construction. Districts were polled to determine if others are having the same issue.

The number of ADT is in the specifications as a requirement for repair. Involvement on some level insures the Contractor is providing good information. It was mentioned that forensics take resources from the District when the Contractor should be responsible. Materials and Construction should assess and tell the contractor to prove that the issue is not their fault. DMRE should be able to review and tell the warranty coordinator forensics are not necessary. Has there been success with the developmental asphalt specification? The Department is allowing polymer in their asphalt but the change will be official in January 2017. If the materials folks can't see the problem associated with an asphalt warranty issue, it should be kicked back to the Contractor to prove. If the Contractor intends to go to DRB, the District may have to do additional forensics. Grinding pavement to remove traffic stripes and that it shouldn't be done was discussed. It will create issues with the pavement down the road. There are multiple issues with segregation around the state so don't give on those percentages. Follow the specification and remove and replace. The Contractor should prepare for the DRB just as the Department will. If we are on the fence on who is responsible for the issue, Districts should core and answer the question before approaching the Contractor. Segregation can be a result of too much work, crews spread thin and different mix designs.

5) PA's Finalizing Asphalt Samples in MAC (David Sadler/Tim Ruelke)

The group to discuss the PA's involvement in the approval process.

Summary Notes:

The conversion from LIMS to MAC was discussed. Keep the PA's involved by having them approve the asphalt samples. All Districts agree to keep approval the way it is in LIMS. QCs and VTs are not project based, so how do you protect against a consultant doing both on the same job? This becomes an audit issue and puts RAZs on the list.

WALK-ON ITEMS:

- 1) **If there is a straight edge deficiency, does the shoulder need to be removed?**

Summary Notes: If it's a straight edge, the shoulder can stay but if its material issues the shoulder should be replaced as well.

- 2) **Do we have a system to identify the smoothest pavement statewide and recognize those areas/jobs?**

Summary Notes: ACAF they want a temperature range for paving operations.